

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 13-18 and 29 are allowed.

Also, as a preliminary matter, Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner has not examined new claim 49 which was added as part of the RCE amendment. Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made in the previous amendment and as such this claim is in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner rejects this claim, Applicants respectfully submit that a non-final action must be submitted, since the claim has not yet been rejected.

Claims 4-6, 8, 10-12, 20-22, 44-47 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement since one or more claims state displaying at least a portion of the drawing surface on both of the multiple displays. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn as there is ample support in the specification. For example, Applicants respectfully point the Examiner to page 4, lines 27-30 where it specifically states that each of the displays may be driven from the drawing surface such that they each display the same images. In addition, other support is provided in the specification as well. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6, 8, 10-12, 20-22, 24-26, 35-37, 39, 41-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Zenda in view of Kotha et al. As a preliminary matter, Applicants respectfully note that there appears to be a typographical error in the rejection as it

refers to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) but the body of the rejection appears to be a 103 rejection. Accordingly, Applicants will treat the rejection as a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In the “Response to Amendment” section of the Office Action, the Examiner again alleges that Zenda reference teaches outputting on multiple displays at the same time. Applicants respectfully request a showing of the claimed subject matter as it is not undisclosed in Zenda. For example, as Applicants have previously noted, the Zenda reference is not directed to a system that supports multiple displays for one drawing surface nor displaying the same drawing surface on both of multiple displays as required by the claim. The Office Action, for example, cites col. 4, lines 20-23. However, this portion merely indicates that the Zenda reference teaches the use of a register to allow the output display on a single screen. When a screen of the selected display mode is smaller than a physical screen of the flat panel display, the screen is displayed at the center of the physical screen of the plasma display device. There is also a low luminence level that serves as a boundary display of the CRT display apparatus. Applicants respectfully request a showing where Zenda teaches displaying the same display or the drawing surface on multiple displays at the same time as multiple display output is not taught or suggested by Zenda. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance.

As for claims 6, 22, 26, 37 and 43, Applicant respectfully asserts that these claims add additional novel and nonobvious subject matter. The other dependent claims are also allowable for adding additional novel and nonobvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that
a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12-21-04

By: C.J. Reckamp
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005